

Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of the Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at Biola University

Professional Services Division

February 24, 1999

Overview of This Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the Accreditation Team visit conducted at Biola University. The report of the team presents the findings based upon reading the Institutional Self-Study Reports, review of supporting documentation and interviews with representative constituencies. On the basis of the report, an accreditation recommendation is made for the institution.

Accreditation Recommendations

- (1) The Team recommends that, based on the attached Accreditation Team Report, the Committee on Accreditation make the following accreditation decision for Biola University and both of its credential programs:

ACCREDITATION WITH TECHNICAL STIPULATIONS

Following are the stipulations:

- That the institution develop and implement a plan to organize and provide adequate faculty and staff resources to meet the needs of the growing student population.
- That the institution provide evidence that candidates and prospective candidates receive consistent and accurate information, advisement and assistance.
- That the institution provide evidence that systematic procedures to monitor and evaluate faculty supervisors have been implemented and that information collected is used to guide continued improvement.
- That the institution provide evidence of a systematic procedure for developing competencies and experiences to help students demonstrate skills in teaching diverse students and English language learners.

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following Credentials:

- Multiple Subject Credentials
 - Single Subject Credentials
- (2) The Team recommends that Biola University provide evidence about the actions taken to respond to all of the stipulations noted above within one year of the date of this action, to be verified by Commission staff.
- (3) Staff recommends that:
- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
 - Biola University be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
 - Biola University be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2004-2005 academic year.

Background Information

The original Bible Institute of Los Angeles, called Biola, founded in 1908, now encompasses the School of Arts and Sciences, Talbot School of Theology, Rosemead School of Psychology, the School of Intercultural Studies, the School of Business, and the School of Continuing Studies. They offer three baccalaureate degrees in 24 majors, 13 masters and six doctoral degrees. With over 3000 students attending Biola University, approximately 400 students are enrolled in undergraduate courses and 300 are pursuing multiple and single subject credentials. This evangelical Christian school is located on a 95 acre site with 700,000 square feet of building space in the southern California community of LaMirada, which is 22 miles southeast of downtown Los Angeles.

Biola University's Multiple and Single Subject Credential Programs correspond with CCTC's preliminary teaching credential requirements which may be completed in conjunction with Biola's undergraduate degrees.

Preparation for the Accreditation Visit

The Commission staff consultant was assigned to the institution in Spring, 1997 and had telephone conversations with the department chair and credential analyst in preparation for a formal meeting with the faculty which was held during the Summer of 1998. Subsequent meetings between the consultant and faculty, program directors, and institutional administration were held as needed. The initial meeting led to decisions about team size, team configuration, standards to be used, format for the institutional self-study report, interview schedule, and logistical and organizational arrangements. In addition, telephone, e-mail, and regular mail communication was

maintained between the staff consultant and institutional representatives. The Team Leader, Dr. James Mahler was selected in August 1998. The team size was agreed upon in August as well.

Preparation of the Institutional Self-Study Report

The Institutional Self-Study Report was prepared beginning with responses to the Common Standards. These responses were developed in reference to the credential programs. This was followed by separate responses to the Multiple Subject and Single Subject Program Standards. The institution decided to use option one (California Program Standards) in the *Accreditation Framework* for the Multiple Subject and Single Subject Credential Programs.

Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team

Decisions about the structure and size of the team were made cooperatively between the department chair, education faculty and staff, and the Commission Consultant. It was agreed that there would be a team of four, consisting of a Team Leader and three team members. The Commission Consultant selected the team members to participate in the review. Team members were selected because of their expertise, experience, and adaptability, and trained in the use of the *Accreditation Framework*.

Intensive Evaluation of Program Data

Prior to the accreditation visit, team members received copies of the appropriate institutional reports and information from Commission staff on how to prepare for the visit. The COA Team Leader and members examined the college responses to the Common Standards and the Program Standards. The on-site phase of the review began on Sunday, February 21, 1999. The team arrived on Sunday afternoon and began deliberations with one another. The team meeting included a review of the accreditation procedures and organizational arrangements for the COA team members.

On Monday and Tuesday, February 22 and 23, the team collected data from interviews and reviewed institutional documents according to procedures outlined in the *Accreditation Handbook*. There was extensive consultation among the team members with much sharing of information. Lunch on Monday and Tuesday was spent sharing data that had been gathered from interviews and document review. The entire team met on Monday evening to discuss progress the first day and share information about findings. The mid-visit report was scheduled for 1:15 on Tuesday. The team had questions and concerns about several of the Common Standards and a few Program Standards going into the mid-visit report. The faculty and staff worked very hard Tuesday afternoon to obtain and present additional information for the team. Tuesday evening was set aside for additional team meetings and the writing of the team report. The team completed writing the report on Tuesday evening, and presented it to the faculty and administration at 9:00 a.m. on Wednesday.

Preparation of the Accreditation Team Report

Pursuant to the *Accreditation Framework*, and the *Accreditation Handbook*, the team prepared a report using a narrative format. For each of the Common Standards, the team made a decision of "Standard Met" or "Standard Not Met." The team had the option of deciding that some of the Common Standards were "Met Minimally" with either Quantitative or Qualitative Concerns. The team then wrote specific narrative comments about each standard providing a finding or rationale for its decision and then outlining perceived Strengths or Concerns relative to the standard.

The team prepared a narrative report about the program standards which pointed out any standards that were not met or not fully met and included explanatory information about findings related to the program standards. The team highlighted specific Strengths and Concerns related to the program

The team included some "Professional Comments" at the end of the report for consideration by the institution. These comments are to be considered as consultative advice from the team members, but are not binding on the institution. They are not considered as a part of the accreditation recommendation of the team.

Accreditation Decisions by the Team

After the report was drafted, the team met Tuesday evening for a final review of the report and a decision about the results of the visit. The team discussed each Common Standard and each Program Standard and decided on the basis of interviews and program documents that six of the eight Common Standards were fully met and nineteen of the twenty-one Program Standards were fully met.

**CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING
COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION
ACCREDITATION TEAM REPORT**

Institution:	Biola University
Program:	Multiple Subject and Single Subject Programs
Dates of Visit:	February 21 to February 24, 1999
Team Leader:	James Mahler, California Lutheran University
Team Member:	J.L. Fortson, Pepperdine University
Team Member:	Paula (Polly) Bowers, Lake Elsinore Unified School District
Team Member:	Marian Reimann, Los Angeles Unified School District
Accreditation Team Recommendation:	ACCREDITATION WITH TECHNICAL STIPULATIONS

Rationale:

The team made its accreditation recommendation based on its findings and the policies set forth in the *Accreditation Framework*. In its deliberations, the team decided that several standards in both Common and Program sections were worthy of being noted in areas of strength and in some cases, areas of concern. Although some areas of concern were noted in the team report, the overall quality of the programs mitigated some of the concerns. After thorough discussion, the team decided to recommend the status of "**Accreditation with Technical Stipulations.**"

The recommendation for "Accreditation with Technical Stipulations" was based on the unanimous agreement of the team. The team felt that the concerns were of sufficient magnitude to place four stipulations on the institution, which are noted in the team report. However, the team determined the institution is determined to have overall quality and effectiveness in its credential programs, apart from the identified technical problems. In light of its investigation the team concluded that there were not important deficiencies or areas of concern that were related to matters of curriculum, field experience, or candidate competence, or the ability of the institution to deliver programs of quality and effectiveness.

The Accreditation team recommends the following stipulations:

- That the institution develop and implement a plan to organize and provide adequate faculty and staff resources to meet the needs of the growing student population.
- That the institution provide evidence that candidates and prospective candidates receive consistent and accurate information, advisement and assistance
- That the institution provide evidence that systematic procedures to monitor and evaluate faculty supervisors have been implemented and that information collected is used to guide continued improvement.
- That the institution provide evidence of a systematic procedure for developing competencies and experiences to help candidates to demonstrate skills in teaching diverse students and English language learners.

DATA SOURCES

INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED		DOCUMENTS REVIEWED	
8	Program Faculty	X	Catalog
9	Institutional Administration	X	Institutional Self Study
38	Candidates	X	Course Syllabi
17	Graduates	X	Candidate Files
5	Employers of Graduates	X	Fieldwork Handbook
10	Supervising Practitioners	X	Follow-up Survey Results
1	Advisors	0	Needs Analysis Results
3	School Administrators	X	Information Booklet
2	Credential Analyst	X	Field Experience Notebook
0	Advisory Committee	0	Schedule of Classes
7	Other Faculty	X	Advisement Documents
		X	Faculty Vitae

Common Standards

Standard 1

Educational Leadership

Standard Met

The educational unit has as an identifiable chain of command from the Education Department through the upper levels of the University Administration .

Program leadership is successfully evolving at this time due to recent changes in personnel, increasing enrollment, and additional complexity of the program design.

Strengths:

Administrators articulate common commitment to the mission and purpose of the University.

Concerns:

The program requires recognition and resolution of the needs of a student population which now includes a growing number of graduate students.

Standard 2

Resources

Standard Met Minimally With Qualitative Concerns

The team felt all the elements of the standard are present but some are met inadequately. The University continues to have to play catch-up with the growth in student population. A long-range plan to meet the growing needs of the department was not evident. If the additional resources promised do not materialize, the program will be negatively impacted.

Strengths:

The pending move to new facilities, the addition of faculty positions this year, and funding for faculty development are examples of increased institutional support.

In addition, recognizing growth in student population, the institution has concrete plans in progress to expand library facilities.

Concerns:

A long-range plan to meet the growing needs of the department was not evident. If the additional resources promised do not materialize, the program will be negatively impacted.

Standard 3**Faculty****Standard Met**

This is a nurturing full-time faculty which is committed to the University and the students whom they serve.

Strength:

Faculty qualifications and experience are appropriate for their assignment.

Concerns:

None noted.

Standard 4**Evaluation****Standard Met**

There is evidence that evaluative data are being collected from a variety of audiences.

Strengths:

None noted

Concerns:

The team is concerned that evaluative data needs to be analyzed in a more systematic fashion and regularly utilized to make improvements in the program. For example, there was little evidence that data about the program in a university thesis project was utilized.

Standard 5**Admission****Standard Met**

Multiple measures are used in the admission process, including the determination of academic and personal qualifications.

Strengths:

It appears that the students admitted to the program represent diverse ethnic, cultural, and socio-economic backgrounds.

The admissions process is well-defined.

Concerns:

None noted.

Standard 6	Advice and Assistance	Standard Met Minimally With Qualitative Concerns
-------------------	------------------------------	---

Rationale:

There was substantial evidence of student dissatisfaction with advisement and assistance as reported in numerous interviews and on program evaluation forms. Students reported that the existing sign-up system was less than satisfactory. They felt that the preferred times were often not available. Occasional examples of misadvisement were also noted.

Strengths:

Record keeping seems to be thorough. The electronic student data base is exceptional.

Concerns:

The team feels the department needs to make consistent advisement and assistance more easily available to all students.

Standard 7	School Collaboration	Standard Met
-------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------

There is a long-standing relationship between the university and schools utilized for student placements.

Strengths:

There is an on-going process for data collection on master teachers.

Concerns:

None noted.

Standard 8	District Field Supervisors	Standard Met
-------------------	-----------------------------------	---------------------

Handbooks for master teachers and student teachers, as well as informational meetings serve to communicate expectations.

Strengths:

None noted.

Concerns:

None noted.

PROGRAM STANDARDS

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional self-study and supporting documentation as well as completion of interview of candidates, faculty, graduates, employers and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all except two program standards were completely met in the Multiple Subject and Single Subject Programs. Category II, Standard 9: Guidance, Assistance, and Feedback was marginally met with qualitative concerns. In Category III, Standard 19: Capacity to Teach Diverse Students was marginally met with qualitative concerns.

Standard 9	Guidance, Assistance, & Feedback	Standard Met Minimally With Qualitative Concerns
-------------------	---	---

Rationale:

The majority of master teachers provide excellent feedback and nurturing mentoring of students. However, based on interviews with a number of current students, alumni, and master teachers, the team concludes that there is uneven and inadequate supervision on the part of institutional supervisors, particularly for student teachers under contract.

Standard 19:	Capacity to Teach Diverse Students	Standard Met Minimally With Qualitative Concerns
---------------------	---	---

Rationale:

Students articulate a strong commitment to service to humanity, consistent with the philosophy of the University. However, based on interviews with school administrators, students, alumni, and master teachers, the team ascertains that attention was lacking in the area of multicultural curricular application and in the area of pedagogy for a diverse population including, but not limited to, young people whose first language is other than English.

Strengths:

Particularly strong components of the programs include:

Interviews with principals, employers and master teachers revealed a commitment on the part of college faculty to develop caring professionals. This is evident in the way the students dress, in the way they present themselves, as well as their involvement in the total school environment. They enter the classroom at a maturity level superior to students the employers have encountered from other institutions.

Students are well grounded in psychological foundations of education and particularly in lesson and unit planning skills. Master teachers noted that student teachers needed little assistance in preparing their daily lessons.

The department is to be commended for developing a systematic field experience program for undergraduates which begins early in a student's career, continues through all coursework and culminates with student teaching. These experiences take place in a variety of classroom settings with diverse populations. These experiences also give students the opportunities to begin working in classrooms on a small scale and progress to full responsibility for the classroom.

Concerns:

- There is a need for further program adjustments for students teaching under contract and graduate or second career students.
- A review of the contents of the Curriculum courses (Multiple Subject, Single Subject) reveals that the scope is too extensive for one course.
- Some employers and master teachers expressed concern regarding subject matter competency.

Professional Comments

(These comments and observations from the team are only for the use of the institution. They are to be considered as consultative advice from team members, but are not binding on the institution. They are not considered as a part of the accreditation recommendation of the team.)

In reviewing the Teaching Under Contract Program, consideration could be given to establishing an Intern Program.

The preparation of credential candidates could be strengthened to enhance the development of middle school teachers.